



United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/641,045	08/17/2000	Kenneth Lee Harper	9209-3	4757
20792 75	590 03/30/2004		EXAMINER	
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC			PARTON, KEVIN S	
PO BOX 37428 RALEIGH, NC 27627			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,	, 2,32,		2153	10
			DATE MAILED: 03/30/2004	, /D

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				109			
. •		Application No.	Applicant(s)	•			
•		09/641,045	HARPER, KENNE	HARPER, KENNETH LEE			
1	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Kevin Parton	2153				
Ti Period for R	ne MAILING DATE of this communication	n appears on the cover s	heet with the correspondence ac	ddress			
A SHOR' THE MAI - Extension- after SIX (- If the period - If NO period - Failure to Any reply	TENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R LING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI s of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C 6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicati d for reply specified above, the maximum statutory reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by received by the Office later than three months after the tent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ION. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however on. , a reply within the statutory minim period will apply and will expire SIX statute, cause the application to b	r, may a reply be timely filed um of thirty (30) days will be considered time ((6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this of the come ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠ Re	sponsive to communication(s) filed on	02/10/2004.					
• .	·	This action is non-final.					
3)☐ Sin	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
clo	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition	of Claims						
4)⊠ Cla 4a) 5)□ Cla 6)⊠ Cla 7)⊠ Cla	tim(s) <u>1-49</u> is/are pending in the application of the above claim(s) is/are with tim(s) is/are allowed. Sim(s) <u>1,2,16-21,35 and 36</u> is/are rejection(s) <u>3-15,22-34 and 37-49</u> is/are objection(s) are subject to restriction is	thdrawn from considerat ted. ected to.					
Application	Papers						
10)☐ The App Re	e specification is objected to by the Exact drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) blicant may not request that any objection objectment drawing sheet(s) including the control of the contr	accepted or b) objecto the drawing(s) be held incorrection is required if the	abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 C				
Priority und	er 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Ack a) Ack 1.[2.[3.[nowledgment is made of a claim for foll b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority docu Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Ethe attached detailed Office action for	iments have been receiv iments have been receiv e priority documents hav Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a	ed. red in Application No e been received in this Nationa)).	I Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of	References Cited (PTO-892)		terview Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of 3) Information	Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 on Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/5 (s)/Mail Date	48) P SB/08) 5) □ N	aper No(s)/Mail Date otice of Informal Patent Application (PT ther:	[·] O-152)			

Art Unit: 2153

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

- 2. Applicant's arguments filed 02/10/2004 regarding claims 1, 20, and 35 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Please see the following reasons and the associated grounds of rejection below.
- 3. Regarding claims 1, 20, and 35, the applicant argues "merely because the packets monitored in Dawson are directed to a source does not mean Dawson teaches the monitoring recitations of claim 1" (page 2, paragraph 3). The examiner still contends that the system of Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) teaches the determination of a point of loss for packets between a source and a destination. Both source and target metrics can be calculated. Further, in the case that an individual packet is being tested, it would clearly be between a single source and a single destination. The reference still reads on the claims as written.
- 4. The applicant further argues that "determining a topology of a network between a particular source and destination makes no sense in the ring context of Dawson" (page 3, paragraph 1). The argument is not persuasive because it is very important to the function of Dawson that each node knows what nodes are upstream and downstream and the topology of the network. Further, in the applicant's specification page 12, paragraph 2, the topology "determination" is described. The topology data may simply be provided to the data processing system. This is analogous to the system of Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) where the topology is

Art Unit: 2153

either known or provided to the nodes so they know their position in the network. In this passage, determining a network topology makes no sense in the context of the claimed invention because the topology data is known and provided to the system with no determination process. Further, the specification goes on the same paragraph to point out that "the benefits of the present invention may be realized using such topology information regardless of how it is obtained."

- 5. The applicant further argues "given the ring architecture of Dawson, there was simply no impetus to modify Dawson to arrive at the recitations of Claim 1 relating to monitoring data records" (page 3, paragraph 2). Please note that the rejection does not modify the system of Dawson (USPN 5,390,188), the system of Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) anticipates the current claims because it teaches the determination of a point of lass between a source and a destination.
- 6. The applicant further argues "such a loss calculation is not even in part based on the topology of the ring network" (page 3, paragraph 3). The argument is not persuasive because in the system of Dawson (USPN 5,390,188), the point of loss is determined at an individual node because of the fact that the ring topology is known. Since there is only one path due to the topology, the point of loss can be determined on a per packet or larger basis. Further, any node may be a source or destination so determining metrics for either is possible.
- 7. All further arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection below.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 3-15, 22-34, and 37-49 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2153

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, 16-21, 35, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dawson (USPN 5,390,188).
- 3. Regarding claims 1, 20, and 35, Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) teaches a system for determining a point of loss for records to be communicated between a source and a destination on a communications network with means for:
 - a. Determining a topology of the communication network between the source and the destination, the topology including a plurality of connecting nodes (figure 1). Note that in the reference, the topology is known by all nodes.
 - Monitoring a number of data records from the source directed to the destination passing between ones of the connecting nodes during a determined period of time (column 10, lines 1-13; column 14, lines 58-62).
 - c. Identifying at least one of the connecting nodes as the point of loss based on the monitored number of data records and the determined topology (column 10, lines 1-13; column 14, lines 58-62).
- 4. Regarding claims 2, 21, and 36 Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) teaches all the limitations as applied to claims 1, 20 and 35, respectively. He further teaches means wherein a plurality of network appliances configured to obtain a number of data records passing between a pair of

Art Unit: 2153

connecting nodes during a time period are positioned between respective ones of the connecting nodes, with means for:

- a. Identifying at least one of the network appliances on the topology (figure 7; column 14, lines 58-62).
- b. Obtaining the number of data records from the source directed to the destination obtained by the identified at least one network appliance during the determined period of time (column 14, lines 58-62; column 15, lines 35-38). Note that in the reference, the loss metrics are sent to management machines for each device.
- 5. Regarding claim 16, Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) teaches a system for determining point of loss for data records to be communicated between a source and a destination on a communication network comprising:
 - a. A memory including a topology of the communication network between the source and the destination, the topology including a plurality of connecting nodes (figure 1). Note that in the reference, the topology is known by all nodes.
 - b. A receiver that receives from a plurality of network appliances at determined locations on the communication network a number of data records from the source directed to the destination passing between ones of the connecting nodes during a determined period of time (column 10, lines 1-13; column 14, lines 58-62).

Art Unit: 2153

- c. A comparison circuit that identifies at least one of the connecting nodes as the point of loss based on the received number of data records, the locations of the network appliances and the topology (column 10, lines 1-13, 26-32).
- 6. Regarding claim 17, Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) teaches all the limitations as applied to claim 16. He further teaches means wherein pairs of the connecting nodes define segments of the topology between the source and the destination and wherein at least one of the network appliances is coupled between each of the pairs of the connecting nodes (figure 1; figure 9).
- 7. Regarding claim 18, Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) teaches all the limitations as applied to claim 17. He further teaches:
 - a. A timer (column 14, lines 58-62).
 - b. A filter that identifies ones of a plurality of data records detected by the at least one of the network appliances that are being transmitted from the source to the destination on the communications network (column 10, lines 1-13).
 - c. A counter that counts filtered one of the plurality of data records, the counter being configured to be reset responsive to the timer; and a transmitter that transmits counts from the counter to the receiver (column 14, lines 58-62; column 15, lines 35-47)
- 8. Regarding claim 19, Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) teaches all the limitations as applied to claim 17. He further teaches means wherein the filter is configured to identify ones of the plurality of data records based on the source Internet Protocol (IP) address and destination IP address of a data packet containing data records detected by the at least one of the network

Art Unit: 2153

appliances (figure 1, figure 9; column 10, lines 1-13). Note that all packets are filtered based on the destination address.

Conclusion

9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Parton whose telephone number is (703)306-0543. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703)305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kevin Parton Examiner Art Unit 2153

ksp

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECKNOLOGY CENTER 2100